

REMARKS

By the foregoing amendment, all of claims 1, 3, 4, 7-15, 19, and 20 have been amended, and claims 16-18 have been canceled. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, 7-15, 19, and 20 are pending. Support for the amended claims can be found throughout the specification and in the previous claims. For example, support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found in previous claim 18. Support for the amendment to claim 4 can be found, for example, in the specification at page 26, first full paragraph. The remaining amendments to the claims correct the preamble of the claims in conformance with claim 1 and to remove minor informalities.

Formal Matters

Initially, Applicant notes that PAIR and on page 2, paragraph 1 of the present Office Action, the Examiner indicates the status of this Action as non-final, which is contrary to the checked box 2a) of the Office Action Summary Sheet. Applicant assumes that the Examiner checked box 2a) inadvertently and intended to check box 2b). Accordingly, Applicant's reply is prepared pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for withdrawing all outstanding rejections.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the information submitted with the Response to the previous Office Action by returning an initialed and signed copy of the Forma PTO-1449.

Claim Objections

The Office Action objects to Claim 1 for not being clear regarding the terms "comprising" and "consisting." The Office objects to Claim 4 for allegedly failing to further limit the subject matter of the previous claim.

In view of the foregoing amendments to claim 1 and claim 4, Applicant submits that claim 1, among other, has also been amended to clarify which portions of the composition encompasses the term comprising, and which portions encompass the term "consisting." Applicant also submits that amended claim 4 is even clearer and further limits the previous claim with respect the amount of

epoxy resin not grafted on the inorganic filler. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The Office Action rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite with respect to the amount of epoxy resin.

In response, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 is clear and definite in view of the parent claim and specification. Applicant submits that claim 1, which is parent to claim 4, clearly describes the basis of the amount of epoxy resin. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to pages 22 and 23 of the present specification where paragraph [0023] describes the test for determining the amount grafted on the inorganic filler. Accordingly, it is clear to one of ordinary skill in the art that the amount not grafted on the inorganic filler can be calculated, for example, from the data determined according to the test described in paragraph [0023]. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits claim 4 is clear and definite and the rejection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly lacking antecedent basis for the term "the glass fiber."

In view of the foregoing amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4 and 10 have been amended to be even more clear and definite. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office raises the following obviousness rejections:

- (a) the Action rejects claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Maekawa et al. (WO 2002/090435) in view of Nakano et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,302,645) and Kudou et al. (US 2002/0123570);
- (b) the Action rejects claims 4, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over

Maekawa et al. in view of Nakano et al., Kudou et al., and Largman et al. (US 4,403,052), with evidence provided by MatWeb(ENC 1299).

By the foregoing amendment, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Maekawa et al. in view of Nakano et al. and Kudou et al., nor Maekawa et al. in view of Nakano et al., Kudou et al., and Largman et al. render the present invention obvious. Applicant notes that to render an invention obvious all elements of the claims must be present or suggested in the cited documents. Applicant respectfully submits that Maekawa et al., Nakano et al., either alone or in their asserted combinations fails to present or suggest:

A molded article comprising a polytrimethylene terephthalate reinforced resin composition comprising 100 parts by weight of resin components and 5 to 300 parts by weight of a crystalline organic filler (C),

wherein the resin components consist of 97.2 to 70 parts by weight of a polytrimethylene terephthalate resin (A1), 2.5 to 29.7 parts by weight of a polycarbonate resin (A2) and 0.3 to 10 parts by weight of an epoxy resin (B), and

wherein the molded article is a bath product, a washroom product, a toilet product, a kitchen product, or a sink product.

Applicant submits that the Office concedes that Maekawa et al. does not teach kitchen, bath, toilet, or washroom products (see Office Action, p. 9, lines 15 and 16). In an attempt to cure this deficiency, the Office combines Maekawa et al. with Kudou et al. for the disclosures of mechanical properties, such as impact resistance, heat stability, and surface appearance by the use of inorganic fillers such as wollastonite, which are allegedly suitable for sinks, drains, and housing equipment. The Office then concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to use the composition of Maekawa et al., Nakano et al., and Kudou to generate molded articles such as sinks or other housing equipment. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not combine the documents as asserted by the Office. Applicant notes that the object in Maekawa et al. is to provide a composition that has improved fatigue properties for use in car parts. Maekawa et al. is silent as to compositions containing PTT for applications as presently claimed in claim 1, which require high-level appearance, mechanical properties, surface hardness, dimensional stability, resistance to hydrolysis, and chemical resistance for use in a bath product, washroom product, toilet product,

kitchen product, or sink product. Since Maekawa is silent with respect to these properties, there is no reason to combine Maekawa et al. with any secondary document that addresses such objectives. In the absence of a reason to combine Maekawa et al. with any of the secondary documents, the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Still further, Applicant notes that Kudou et al. discloses polyoxymethylene resins, which are not polytrimethylene terephthalate resins as claimed. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be led by Kudou et al. to choose polytrimethylene terephthalate resins for a bath product, washroom product, toilet product, kitchen product, or sink product, but rather would choose polyoxymethylene resins. The Office relies on the mechanical properties of the resins by Kudou et al., which relate to polyoxymethylene resins and not to polytrimethylene terephthalate resins. There is nothing in Kudou et al. that would lead one of ordinary skill to the choice of polytrimethylene terephthalate for the presently claimed bath product, washroom product, toilet product, kitchen product, or sink product. Since there is nothing in Kudou et al. that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art, Kudou et al. does not cure any deficiency of the other documents cited in the rejection and the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejections.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. If any issues yet remain which can be resolved by a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number below.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Junko KAKEGAWA

Sean Meyer Payne
Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027 42,920

March 16, 2009
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, Virginia 20191
(703) 716-1191